

REMARKS

Claims 1-75 and 87-95 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 26-32, 34, 38, 42, 46, 49, 51, 52, 56-58, 61-63, 65, and 71 being amended as will be explained herebelow; and claims 87-95 being newly added. Previously withdrawn claims 76-86 have been canceled without prejudice to seek the subject matter thereof in a subsequent filing.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowance of claims 56-64 and allowability of claims 11-13, 28-30,¹ and 51-52. To the extent any of the foregoing claims recited the term "leg" (or "legs"), they have been amended to replace the term with "arm" (or "arms") to be consistent with the terminology used in the specification, but without changing the scope thereof. Also, independent claims 11, 28, and 51 have been rewritten into independent form and so are submitted to be in condition for allowance. As claims 12-13, 29-30, and 52 depend, respectively, therefrom, they too are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that, in addition to claims 56-64, claims 11-13, 28-30, and 51-52, should now also be allowed.

Rejected Claims

The remaining claims, namely claims 1-10, 14-27, 31-55,² and 65-75, stand rejected as anticipated by either or both of Doyle U.S. Patent No. 6,290,206 ("Doyle")

¹ Claims 31 and 32 were indicated to be allowable as they depended from claim 28, but have now been amended to depend from claim 26.

² It is assumed that claims 31 and 32 would have been rejected over the art in view of the change in dependency thereof. *See* n.1.

or Mathieu U.S. Patent No. 4,745,950 ("Mathieu"), both of which were cited by Applicants. While Applicants submit the rejections are in error and should be withdrawn, in order to streamline prosecution and move the case to allowance, Applicants have amended the independent claims thereof (1, 18, 34, 42, 49, 65, and 71) to recite a further feature clearly missing from Doyle and Mathieu, namely, a releasable clip that has "a portion movable relative to the fluid tube" and the clip "being configured to selectively secure the fluid tube in such sealing engagement" with the end of the catheter "with movement of the movable clip portion relative to the fluid tube".³

With respect to Doyle, Examiner asserts that groove 76 is a "releasable clip". Even were that accurate, it is clear that there is no portion of groove 76 which is movable relative to connector 10 (which Examiner calls a fluid tube) nor any other aspect of base 4 (which Examiner contends is an adaptor) of Doyle. Rather, base 4 is a unified member which has no portion movable relative to another portion. Accordingly, no aspect of the so-called adaptor 4 of Doyle can provide the claimed clip, and particularly a portion movable relative to the fluid tube thereof, nor is any portion of base 4 configured to sealingly secure in sealing engagement with the end of a catheter with movement of such a movable clip portion relative to such a fluid tube thereof. It is submitted, therefore, that Doyle does not anticipate the rejected claims, and the rejections thereof should be withdrawn.

³ Dependent claims 3, 9, 20, 26, 38, and 46 have been amended and dependent claims 87 and 88 have been added to recite specific examples of the movable clip portion. Dependent claims 89-95 have been added to make clear that the selective securing of the independent claims need not necessarily be with the movable clip portion. Further, claims 4, 10, 15, 21, 27, and 32 have been amended to correct dependency and/or adjust the language to correlate with the other claims as now amended.

Mathieu is similarly deficient. In that regard, Examiner asserts that the male connector piece 6 is an adaptor, that sleeve 21 is a fluid tube, and that the pin 46 thereof is a releasable clip. Even were that an appropriate conclusion, it is clear that there is no portion of pin 46 which is movable relative to sleeve 21, much less any other aspect of piece 6 in Mathieu. In that regard, piece 6 is a unified member which has no portion movable relative to another portion. Accordingly, no aspect of the so-called adaptor 6 of Mathieu can provide the claimed clip, and particularly a portion movable relative to the fluid tube thereof, nor is any portion of piece 6 configured to sealingly secure in sealing engagement with the end of the catheter with movement of such a movable clip portion relative to such a fluid tube thereof. As with Doyle, Mathieu does not anticipate the rejected claims and so it is respectfully submitted that the rejections thereof should be withdrawn.

In addition to the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no basis to suggest that any part of base 4 of Doyle or connecting piece 6 of Mathieu should be modified to have a clip portion so movable relative to a fluid tube thereof. Consequently, neither Doyle nor Mathieu would provide a basis for any obviousness rejections.

Conclusion

Applicants reserve the right to present other or additional arguments in support of patentability of any or all of the claims, but submit that the foregoing is sufficient to resolve the present rejections and objections, and to place the application in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests a formal Notice of Allowance at the earliest opportunity. If any issues remain, Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone undersigned attorney in an effort to promptly resolve same.

The fee due for the one-month extension of time is being submitted concurrently with this communication by credit card payment. If any other fee is due, please take this as authorization to charge same to our Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: /kurt l grossman/
Kurt L. Grossman, Reg. No. 29,799

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)